

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

RUSSELL D. ROSCO and BONNIE
R. ROSCO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EQUIFAX INFORMATION
SERVICES; AMERICREDIT;
GLOBAL LENDING AUTO
FINANCE; CONSUMER
PORTFOLIO SERVICES; COSTCO
WAREHOUSE; EXETER
FINANCIAL; EXPERIAN
INFORMATION SOLUTIONS;
FIRST BANK MORTGAGE;
FLAGSHIP CREDIT; GLOBAL
LENDING SERVICES, INC.;
GROSSINGER KIA; LAFONTAINE
TOYOTA; REGIONAL
ACCEPTANCE; ADVANTAGE
GROUP; TIDEWATER CREDIT; and
TRANSUNION LLS,

Defendants.

NO: 2:15-CV-325-RMP

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR PARTIAL DISMISSAL
OF CLAIMS AGAINST CREDIT
BUREAUS

1 BEFORE THE COURT is Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Dismissal of Claims
2 Against Credit Bureaus, ECF No. 89. The Court has reviewed the motion, the
3 record, and is fully informed.

4 Plaintiffs' motion seeks to dismiss only some of the claims they allege
5 against three Defendants: Equifax Information Services, Experian Information
6 Solutions, and TransUnion LLS. *See* ECF No. 89. The Court understands the
7 motion to be referring to their First Amended Complaint, as the numbered
8 paragraphs enumerated in the motion correspond to those listed under those
9 numbers in the First Amended Complaint.¹ Although the motion does not seek to
10 dismiss these three Defendants entirely, Plaintiffs attempt to clarify by stating that

11 Plaintiff's [sic] did not intend nor do they desire to pursue any liability
12 action against the named credit bureaus in claims 25, 31, 51, 53, 55, 57,
13 59, and 61 as they were too far removed from the transactions alleged
14 by the Plaintiffs' [sic] that they had not chosen a vehicle and therefore
15 there was nothing to finance or they were only the recipients of the false
information. These claims and only these claims against the credit
bureaus should be dismissed with prejudice. These claims as stated
against the other named defendants in the claims are not to be
dismissed.

16 ECF No. 89 at 2. The Court is unable to determine how these three Defendants are
17 unlike the other Defendants in this case, or why they should be kept in this matter

18
19 ¹ The Court notes that Plaintiffs' reproduction of the specified claims contain
20 minor grammatical differences from those same claims in the First Amended
21 Complaint. Nonetheless, they allege the same substantive content.

1 at all if they are “too far removed from the transactions alleged by Plaintiffs.” *Id.*

2 However, Plaintiffs are requesting that these claims be dismissed with prejudice, so
3 the Court finds good cause to grant this voluntary dismissal of the specified
4 portions of these claims.

5 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

6 1. Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Dismissal of Claims Against Credit
7 Bureaus, **ECF No. 89**, is **GRANTED**.

8 2. The claims brought against Defendants Equifax Information Services,
9 Experian Information Solutions, and TransUnion LLS in paragraphs 25, 31, 51, 53,
10 55, 57, 59, and 61 of the First Amended Complaint are **DISMISSED WITH**
11 **PREJUDICE**.

12 The District Court Clerk is directed to enter this Order and provide copies to
13 counsel and pro se parties.

14 **DATED** this 23rd day of May 2016.

15
16 s/ Rosanna Malouf Peterson
17 ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21